

*Leptachatina brevicula* Pease? The name queried by Dr. Cooke, and in fact it appears to be a different species, the aperture being conspicuously different from that of a cotype figured in the Manual.

*L. brevicula micra* Cooke. This is known in a living state from altitudes of 1500 to 1700 feet.

*L. leucochila* Gulick.

*L. antiqua* Pease? Name queried by Dr. Cooke. It is like the Koloa beach shells figured in the Manual, but very different from the more slender shell figured by Pease. Surely it should receive a new name.

*Tornatellides macromphala* Ancey. One juvenile.

*Endodonta laminata* Pease. A typical *Endodonta*, with keel.

*Nesophila* sp., apparently undescribed, but Dr. Cooke had 3 already, his MS. species "No. 8."

*Helicina berniceia* Pilsbry and Cooke. Only known fossil.

It would appear that these sandhill deposits are of Pleistocene age, reminding one very much of the deposits in the sandhills at Caniçal, Madeira, and with apparently about the same proportion of extinct species. I greatly regretted that I could not spend more time collecting in this locality.

---

#### THE TYPE OF ANCYLASTRUM IS ANCYLUS FLUVIATILIS, MULLER

---

BY A. S. KENNARD, A. L. S. AND B. B. WOODWARD, F. L. S.

---

But for the fact that more pressing work engaged us, Mr. Bryant Walker's reading of the facts governing the selection of the type of *Ancylastrum*<sup>1</sup> would have been challenged before.

The Rule (Art. 30, 11 e) is quite clear: "Species are excluded from consideration in determining the type of genera . . . which were not included under the generic name at the time of its original publication."

When *Ancylastrum* was created<sup>2</sup> the species *cumingianus* had

<sup>1</sup> Nautilus, XXXV, 1921, p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Journ. de Conchyl., iv, 1853, p. 63. The name was employed, as the author admits, in agreement with Moquin-Tandon, who, however, claims it as his own (Hist. Moll. France, ii, p. 483).

not even been conceived; it first appears as a *nomen nudum* in what Mr. Walker admits was a later paper (*tom. cit.*, p. 170), but it was not born until July, 1854 (*Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.*, 1853 [1854], p. 91). It is quite obvious, therefore, that by no amount of sophistry can *cumingianus* be made the type of *Ancylastrum*.

The case is really quite simple. Although Beck in 1837 had divided the genus and created *Acroluxus* for the *lacustris* group he gave no reasons for so doing. It was Gray in 1840<sup>1</sup> who made the division on anatomical grounds. He did not, as Bourguignat erroneously asserts, make at that time two genera, but as his numeration of his genera and species shows, separated off his *Velletia* as a subgenus, without, however, giving it that distinction. His arrangement was:

3. *Ancylus*

1. *Ancylus fluviatilis*

*Velletia*

2. *Velletia lacustris*.

His two divisions were each for a single species and therefore even then monotypical, but all doubt as to the intended types is set at rest by his article in the *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.*, 1847 (p. 181), where the same arrangement obtains and the two species are definitely named by him as types.<sup>2</sup> This last paper has entirely escaped Mr. Walker's observation. It was not until 1857 in his second edition of *Turton's Manual* (pp. 216 and 220) that Gray made these divisions into two distinct genera.

Expressed in modern manner Gray's classification in 1840 and 1847 was:

Genus *Ancylus*

Subg. *Ancylus* (*s. s.*)

Subg. *Velletia*.

Bourguignat in 1853 (*loc. cit.*, p. 63) accepted Gray's subdivisions, but, as the fashion then was, instead of retaining the

<sup>1</sup> *Turton's Manual*, new ed., p. 217.

<sup>2</sup> Here also he admits that *Acroluxus* and *Velletia* are synonyms.

name of the genus for one section as "s. s." he gave a distinctive name for each section, thus:

Genus *Ancylus*

S. g. *Ancylastrum*.

S. g. *Velletia*.

Bourguignat's *Ancylastrum* was therefore merely a *nom. nov.* for *Ancylus* as limited by Gray.

Now by the Rules (Art. 30, II, f.) "In case a generic name without originally designated type [in this case *Ancylastrum*] is proposed as a substitute for another generic name, with or without type [in this case *Ancylus*, type *A. fluviatilis*] the type of either, when established, becomes *ipso facto* type of the other." Hence the type of *Ancylastrum* is by the Rules beyond question *A. fluviatilis* (Müller), and Mr. Walker's *Pseudancylus*<sup>1</sup> goes to swell the ever-lengthening list of unwanted synonyms.

#### ON THE *HELIX PERSPECTIVA* OF MEGERLE VON MUHLFELD VERSUS THAT OF SAY

BY A. S. KENNARD A. L. S. AND B. B. WOODWARD, F. L. S.

Megerle's paper "Beschreibung einiger neuen Conchylien" was published in the Mag. Gesell. Naturf. Freunde Berlin, Vol. viii (pp. 3-11), the title page of which is dated 1818. It seems, however, that the volume in question was published in four parts: Pt. i, 1816; pt. ii, 1817; pt. iii, 1817, and pt. iv, 1818,<sup>1</sup> and that Megerle's paper appeared in the first part.

Say's name came out the following year in the Journ. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philad., i, p. 18. Consequently Megerle's name holds, and the *Helix solaris*, of Menke becomes its synonym,

<sup>1</sup> Nautilus, XXXV, p. 58.

<sup>2</sup> See Isis, 1818, col. 1448, 1707 and 1809 [The reference to Megerle's paper on page or column 1483—*Ed.*] also Mém. Acad. Sci. St. Pétersbourg, vi-ix.—(C. Davies Sherborn (Index Animalium). This appears to have been known, in part at all events, to Binney and Bland, for they give the correct date for *Helix cereolus* Megerle, which appears in the same paper.